Finkle may decide to redact portions of documents, allowing the remainder of the document to be disclosed.]"

- Paragraph 4(a): The OIC Staff requests the Commissioner change "as unprivileged and unprotected "to" as unprivileged [or] unprotected."
- **Paragraph 6:** The OIC Staff requests the Commissioner add to the last part of the first sentence the words noted in the brackets: "...and work product claims [in the context of this proceeding and the nature of the transaction proposed by Premera in its Form A.]"

2. Substantive changes.

• **Paragraph 4.** The OIC Staff objects to the last two sentences of this paragraph and requests the Commissioner strike them and replace with the following sentences:

"Judge Finkle will determine whether the dispute is substantial enough to delay triggering the commencement of the case schedule. In that instance, the trigger date would not be initiated until the dispute is resolved."

<u>Rationale:</u> If Premera disputes Judge Finkle's determination as described in paragraph 4(b), then Premera should appeal to the Commissioner as set forth in paragraph 4 of the Commissioner's Seventh Order. If the dispute regards a substantial amount of documents, the trigger date for the commencement of the case schedule needs to be adjusted accordingly. Additionally, to require a subpoena of records already at issue in discovery would be inappropriate. The Commissioner has already rejected a subpoena option in this matter.

- **Paragraph 5**. The OIC Staff objects to the last sentence of this paragraph and requests the Commissioner strike it. <u>Rationale</u>: The parties agree that any *in camera* review by Judge Finkle does not constitute waiver of privilege and this sentence is redundant in that respect. Additionally, the language is overbroad in that the Commissioner cannot deny any party the ability to *seek* access, even if that access is subsequently denied.
- Paragraph 6. The OIC Staff requests that the Commissioner add the following language between the second and third sentence:

"During the *in camera* review, Judge Finkle will designate each document into one of the following categories: 1) not privileged; 2) privileged and not relevant to the States' review of the

1 2	conversion proposal; 3) privileged and relevant; or 4) privileged and relevant and disclosable in part with redaction. Judge Finkle will then provide this list to the parties upon completion of his <i>in camera</i> review."
3	
4	<u>Rationale:</u> This categorization will substantially assist the parties in determining what information was withheld due to privilege and how to take
5	that into consideration when drafting reports.
6	
7	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 23rd day of July, 2003.
8	
9	OFFICE OF INSURANCE COMMISSIONER
10	STATE OF WASHINGTON
11	
12	By:
13	Charles D. Brown, WSBA #5555 For John Hamje, Staff Attorney
14	Legal Affairs Division Office of the Insurance Commissioner
15	360-725-7046 360-586-3109 (Facsimile)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	